

In the Matter of:

Jonathan R., et al.,

VS

JIM JUSTICE, et al.

APRIL ROBERTSON

November 21, 2023



5010 Dempsey Drive
Cross Lanes WV 25313
304-415-1122

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
AT HUNTINGTON

JONATHAN R., et al.,

Plaintiffs,

-vs- Case No. 3:19-cv-00710

JIM JUSTICE, in his official capacity as
Governor of West Virginia, et al.,

Defendants.

DEPOSITION OF APRIL ROBERTSON

The deposition of April Robertson was
taken on November 21, 2023, at 9:00 a.m.,
at 2116 Kanawha Boulevard, East, Charleston,
West Virginia.

ELITE COURT REPORTING, LLC
5010 Dempsey Drive
Cross Lanes, West Virginia 25313
(304) 415-1122

Tara Arthur, CCR

A P P E A R A N C E S

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Richard W. Walters
J. Alexander Meade
Attorneys at Law
Shaffer & Shaffer, PLLC
P.O. Box 3973
Charleston, West Virginia 25339-3973

Julia Tebor
Lindsay Gus
Attorneys at Law
A Better Childhood
355 Lexington Avenue, Floor 16
New York, New York 10017
(Participated via Zoom)

Marty Mazezka
Attorney at Law
Disability Rights of West Virginia
1207 Quarrier Street, Suite 400
Charleston, West Virginia 25301

Caroline M. Brown
Rebecca Wolfe
Attorneys at Law
Brown & Piesch, PLLC
1233 20th Street NW, Suite 505
Washington, DC 20001

Steven R. Compton
Attorney at Law
West Virginia Attorney General's Office
812 Quarrier Street, Second Floor
Charleston, West Virginia 25301
(Participated via Zoom)

Also Present via Zoom: Laura Welikson

1 I N D E X

2 WITNESS

3 April Robertson

4 EXAMINATION

5 by Mr. Meade Page 04

6 EXHIBITS

7 None

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 Reporter's Certificate: Page 74
18 Errata Sheet/Signature Page: Enclosed

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 APRIL ROBERTSON,
2 called as a witness, first being duly sworn
3 by the Court Reporter/Notary Public,
4 testified as follows, to wit:

5 EXAMINATION

6 BY MR. MEADE:

7 Q. Ms. Robertson, to start things off,
8 would you please state your full name for
9 the record?

10 A. April Lynn Robertson.

11 Q. Have you ever been deposed before?

12 A. No.

13 Q. Have you ever been involved in a
14 deposition before?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. In what capacity?

17 A. Yours.

18 Q. So as counsel?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. So you already know the rules. You
21 know how these things work. But just for
22 the sake of the record, I will go through a
23 couple of basic things.

24 Obviously, the answers to questions

1 need to be audible. The court reporter
2 can't really take down nods and hand
3 gestures and things like that. If you don't
4 understand anything that I ask, feel free to
5 just ask me to repeat myself or to go into a
6 little more detail.

7 As we go through this, if you need
8 to take a break, just ask for it. That's
9 fine. We can take as many breaks as you
10 would like.

11 If your attorney at any point
12 during this objects to something, that's for
13 the purposes of admission or admissibility
14 down the road. Continue to answer the
15 question. If there needs to be any sort of
16 break or conversation, we can handle that at
17 that point.

18 Other than that, would you care to
19 go into some detail -- what is your current
20 title at the Department of Health and Human
21 Resources?

22 A. General counsel.

23 Q. Okay. How long have you been in
24 that role?

1 A. Since May of 2019.

2 Q. So then you have been general
3 counsel at the DHHR for the entirety of the
4 pendency of this litigation?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Were you affiliated with the
7 Department of Health and Human Resources
8 prior to May of 2019?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. What role were you in prior to
11 that?

12 A. Interim general counsel and
13 assistant general counsel and general
14 counsel for the Office of Inspector General.

15 Q. So, in totality, how long have you
16 been involved in some aspect with the
17 Department of Health and Human Resources?

18 A. Just about 12 years.

19 Q. So have you been involved in your
20 capacity as either general counsel or
21 assistant general counsel or interim general
22 counsel -- from now on, I will just say
23 general counsel -- with any prior litigation
24 against the Department of Health and Human

1 Resources?

2 A. What do you mean by involved?

3 Q. Have you been involved in
4 specifically the discovery process or
5 production of documents?

6 A. No.

7 Q. Have you ever had to have contact
8 with the West Virginia Office of Technology
9 in your role as general counsel other than
10 in this suit?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Can you give me some detail exactly
13 about what that prior involvement was?

14 A. Sending litigation holds to them.

15 Q. Do you have any idea about how many
16 times that you have sent a litigation hold
17 to the Office of Technology?

18 A. Over 20 times.

19 Q. And is that fairly frequent, or is
20 that 20 times sparsed out between the decade
21 or so that you have been employed with the
22 department?

23 A. Sparsed out since 2017.

24 Q. So you did not ever issue a

1 litigation hold prior to 2017?

2 A. Correct.

3 Q. Does the Office of General Counsel
4 have a typical procedure that is followed
5 when it comes to issuing a litigation hold?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. What is that policy?

8 A. I follow the litigation hold
9 template that I inherited from my
10 predecessors and alter it slightly depending
11 on the case at issue and discuss with
12 leadership in the department and the
13 affected Bureau to determine who needs to be
14 on the litigation hold.

15 Q. Once a hold is issued, do you have
16 any ongoing involvement in the discovery
17 process or the production of documentation?

18 A. No.

19 Q. In your experience, since you have
20 begun issuing litigation holds - so back in
21 2017 - have there ever been any issues
22 regarding the production of electronically
23 stored information from the West Virginia
24 Office of Technology?

1 A. Not to my knowledge.

2 Q. Now, you just stated a moment ago
3 you are not really involved in the discovery
4 process; is that correct?

5 A. Correct.

6 Q. So unless there were an issue that
7 rose to a significant level, would you be
8 aware of any problems with the production of
9 ESI?

10 A. Probably not.

11 Q. As general counsel, or maybe even
12 more specifically as incoming assistant
13 general counsel, did you receive any
14 specific type of training on the
15 preservation of electronically stored
16 information?

17 A. No.

18 Q. To the best of your knowledge, is
19 there any policy or procedure that is
20 distributed within the department at large
21 regarding the preservation of electronically
22 stored information?

23 A. Not to my knowledge.

24 Q. If such a policy were to exist,

1 would that be the province of the General
2 Counsel's Office?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. So would it stand to reason if such
5 a policy existed, you would likely know of
6 it?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. On November 17th of this year, I
9 believe you signed an affidavit regarding
10 your involvement with the preservation of
11 ESI in this case; is that correct?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Within that affidavit, you discuss
14 something that is called deprovisioning of
15 employees. Do you recall that?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Are you familiar with that process?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. So within your affidavit, you note
20 that the cabinet secretary in particular
21 authorizes the deprovisioning of stored
22 information or email accounts or what have
23 you with outgoing personnel; is that
24 correct?

1 A. Not exactly.

2 Q. Could you explain what exactly
3 about that is not correct?

4 A. It's staff in the office of the
5 cabinet secretary that deprovisions certain
6 departing employees.

7 Q. Who determines which departing
8 employees are deprovisioned?

9 A. I am only familiar with that
10 process in the office of the cabinet
11 secretary because that's where I am. And it
12 would involve employees from our office.

13 Q. So General Counsel's Office is
14 involved in the deprovisioning process?

15 A. Not exactly.

16 Q. So what role then does general
17 counsel have in deprovisioning?

18 A. None.

19 Q. So have you yourself been involved
20 in any of the discussions or decisions with
21 -- involving the deprovisioning of outgoing
22 staff who are named defendants in this
23 action?

24 A. Yes.

1 Q. To what extent were you involved in
2 those discussions or decisions?

3 A. Looking at the online fillable form
4 with the secretary -- administrative
5 secretary in the office who fills that
6 out -- and there's -- to see what the
7 questions are and to ask her how she
8 typically answers them.

9 Q. What are the questions surrounding
10 deprovisioning just as a general rule, if
11 there are any typical questions?

12 A. It's an online fillable form
13 provided by the West Virginia Office of
14 Technology, what we refer to as OT. And
15 it's primarily the employee's name, the date
16 of their departure, when we want them to be
17 deprovisioned. And that means have all of
18 their access cut off to their accounts,
19 their access cards to buildings.
20 Deprovisioning is an act of taking away
21 someone's access.

22 Q. This form that you are talking
23 about, is that form used in all
24 deprovisioning?

1 A. I believe so. It's not our form.
2 It's OT's.

3 Q. So with regard to staff who were
4 subject to a litigation hold in this matter
5 who have since exited their roles at the
6 department, would the deprovisioning form
7 for those members still be in existence?

8 A. You would have to ask OT.

9 Q. And it's your testimony here today
10 that that deprovisioning form is generated
11 from the office of the cabinet secretary; is
12 that correct?

13 A. It's filled in by the
14 administrative secretary and submitted to
15 OT, but just for the highly placed employees
16 who work in the cabinet secretary's office.

17 Q. Okay. Highly placed employees,
18 would that be individuals like deputy
19 secretaries or the directors of the various
20 agencies within the department?

21 A. Deputy secretary, yes. Bureau
22 commissioners, probably. Lower than that, I
23 couldn't say.

24 Q. Okay. So then just for example,

1 the former commissioner for what was the
2 Bureau for Children and Families, Linda
3 Watts -- when she exited that role, if her
4 account -- or there was authorization for
5 her deprovisioning, if that occurred, that
6 would have been filled in and sent to the
7 Office of Technology by the administrative
8 secretary and the cabinet secretary's
9 office; is that correct?

10 A. That would be speculation on my
11 part.

12 Q. Well -- and again, if she were
13 deprovisioned, is that how that process
14 would work?

15 A. I don't know if someone at the
16 Bureau for Children and Families would have
17 taken care of that at that time.

18 Q. To the best of your knowledge, were
19 any of the named defendants in this matter
20 authorized for deprovisioning since this
21 case has been pending?

22 A. As soon as someone leaves, their
23 access to their state accounts is
24 terminated.

1 Q. Who at the Office of Technology
2 receives the authorization for
3 deprovisioning?

4 A. Her first name is Ruby. I don't
5 know her last name.

6 Q. Is that a specific position within
7 the Office of Technology?

8 A. You would have to ask OT.

9 Q. So you are just not aware?

10 A. No.

11 Q. Are the authorizations, these
12 fillable forms for deprovision, are those
13 something that are also kept by the
14 department, or are those purged after they
15 are sent to the Office of Technology?

16 A. I don't believe it is something
17 that can be downloaded and printed or saved
18 in any way.

19 Q. What do you mean by that? You said
20 it was a fillable form; is that right?

21 A. Yes. You fill it in and hit send.
22 I have not participated in the process
23 myself.

24 Q. So you don't know whether or not

1 there is, for example, a PDF of that
2 completed form that is preserved by the
3 department?

4 A. I don't know.

5 Q. Have you actually read one of these
6 fillable forms for deprovisioning?

7 A. I have looked over the shoulder of
8 the administrative secretary and read the
9 fields that she must fill in when
10 deprovisioning someone -- excuse me --
11 requesting that someone be deprovisioned.

12 Q. Does the Office of Technology ever
13 refuse to deprovision someone who has been
14 authorized for deprovisioning?

15 A. You would have to ask them.

16 Q. Are you aware of that ever
17 occurring?

18 MR. BROWN: This is sort of
19 an objection. Because I think you need
20 to define the term "deprovisioning" for
21 the questions that you are asking and the
22 answers that you are getting.

23 MR. MEADE: Well, and I
24 think we can do that just for the sake of

1 --

2 Q. As you have been answering these
3 questions regarding deprovisioning, what are
4 you taking that word to mean?

5 A. Cutting off a departing employee's
6 access to the state system.

7 Q. Okay. And then I think we can use
8 that definition. That's fine. That's my
9 understanding of it.

10 MR. BROWN: Okay.

11 Q. But within this fillable form for
12 deprovisioning, is there anything which
13 addresses the possibility of pending
14 litigation holds with regard to outgoing
15 staff?

16 A. There is not.

17 Q. After any of the named defendants
18 or individuals within this matter that were
19 subject to a litigation hold -- after they
20 departed employment by the department, did
21 the General Counsel's Office follow up with
22 the Office of Technology to ensure that
23 their electronically stored information was
24 being preserved?

1 A. No.

2 Q. Why?

3 A. I had no reason to assume that

4 there would be any problem.

5 Q. Ms. Robertson, did you read the

6 affidavit that was provided by the chief

7 information officer for the Office of

8 Technology that was submitted as an exhibit

9 to the Defendants' Response to our Motion

10 for Sanctions in this case?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Are you aware then that the Office

13 of Technology's policy for deleting emails

14 and things of that nature after 30 days has

15 been in place for at least a decade?

16 A. I am now.

17 Q. You were not previously aware of

18 that policy; is that your statement?

19 A. Define "previously."

20 Q. Prior to let's say September of

21 this year, were you aware of the Office of

22 Technology's policy regarding deletion or

23 purging of electronically stored information

24 with regard to staff who has separated from

1 state employment?

2 A. I was not.

3 Q. Despite that policy having been in
4 place the entire time that you have served
5 as general counsel, you were not aware of
6 that?

7 A. Correct.

8 Q. Is it your practice upon sending a
9 litigation hold to have any follow-up
10 communication with the Office of Technology?

11 A. No.

12 Q. In your affidavit, which was I
13 believe -- I think Exhibit A to the
14 Defendants' Response and Opposition to our
15 Motion for Sanctions, you stated that you
16 submitted or sent a litigation hold in
17 December of 2019; is that right?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Were you asked to do that?

20 A. I don't remember exactly. But I
21 assume that we had some discussions with
22 leadership and policy folks who worked with
23 the subject matter of this litigation and
24 possibly outside counsel.

1 Q. Is the West Virginia Attorney
2 General's Office ever involved in
3 discussions regarding litigation holds?

4 A. Not with me.

5 Q. Okay. So the Attorney General's
6 Office did not contact you with regard to a
7 litigation hold in this case?

8 A. I don't remember.

9 Q. If you have communication with the
10 Attorney General's Office, is that typically
11 conducted through email or by some other
12 means?

13 A. Various means.

14 Q. Would that be by phone or anything
15 else besides by phone?

16 A. In person.

17 Q. Is there any sort of I guess
18 interoffice communication besides email,
19 such as -- I don't know if you are familiar
20 with Slack or an online chat or something
21 like that?

22 A. Our wv.gov network that OT provides
23 to state executive branch agencies -- we are
24 now on Google. And there is a chat feature,

1 what we use to refer to as instant message.

2 Q. Okay. And who has access to that
3 system?

4 A. State employees.

5 Q. Is that all state employees?

6 A. Who are on the Google system.

7 Q. All right. Is there any specific
8 designation that determines who is given
9 access to the Google system?

10 A. The decision was made a few years
11 ago to the transition executive branch
12 agencies from the Microsoft Office suite of
13 products over to the Google suite of
14 products.

15 Q. Do you know whether or not the
16 cabinet secretary for the Department of
17 Health and Human Resources has access to
18 that system?

19 MR. BROWN: Objection. Vague.

20 A. I have no reason to doubt that the
21 cabinet secretaries do have access to that.

22 Q. Have you ever had communication
23 with a cabinet secretary through that
24 system?

1 MR. BROWN: Objection. Vague.

2 A. I don't think so. You are talking
3 about the chat feature?

4 Q. The chat feature specifically.

5 A. No.

6 Q. When this litigation hold was sent
7 in 2019, was it sent by email? By regular
8 mail? In-person delivery? How was it sent
9 to its intended recipients?

10 A. Email.

11 Q. Was that email -- was it just a
12 group email? Was it individual emails to
13 each person intended to be included?

14 A. Group.

15 Q. Did you receive any responses to
16 that email?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Do you still have those email
19 responses?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Did you receive a response from
22 each of the individuals that were sent that
23 litigation hold?

24 A. No.

1 Q. Do you recall which individuals you
2 received a response from?

3 A. I do have a list of those. I would
4 have to refer to the list to refresh my
5 recollection.

6 Q. Do you know whether or not the
7 response emails to your litigation hold have
8 been produced at all in response to this
9 discovery issue that we are currently
10 conducting a deposition over?

11 A. I don't know the answer to that
12 question.

13 Q. Have you provided those response
14 emails to the Attorney General's Office or
15 outside counsel?

16 A. I believe outside counsel has them.

17 Q. Okay. The litigation hold that you
18 provided as a -- we will call it an exhibit
19 to your affidavit, specifically the document
20 which is numbered 3991 in the docket entries
21 for the pending federal case -- there is a
22 final page which says Acknowledgement. Do
23 you know what page I am referring to?

24 A. Yes.

1 Q. What is the purpose of that
2 acknowledgement?

3 A. To make sure people received the
4 litigation hold.

5 Q. Did you receive any signed
6 acknowledgements from the individuals who
7 were subject to this litigation hold?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Did you receive a signed
10 acknowledgement from anyone at the West
11 Virginia Office of Technology?

12 A. No.

13 Q. If you did not receive an
14 acknowledgement, how are you certain that
15 the Office of Technology actually reviewed
16 this hold?

17 A. I can't speak to what they may read
18 or not read in their inboxes.

19 Q. Isn't the purpose of this
20 acknowledgement to determine whether or not
21 they read it?

22 A. The purpose in my mind is primarily
23 to make sure our DHHR folks are seeing it
24 and making sure that they understand.

1 Q. So did you receive a signed
2 acknowledgement to the litigation hold from
3 all of the individuals within the DHHR who
4 received a copy of it?

5 A. No.

6 Q. Did you have any follow-up
7 conversations with any of the individuals
8 that you sent the litigation hold to but did
9 not provide a signed acknowledgement?

10 A. I did not.

11 Q. Why?

12 A. Because the Bureau attorney who
13 monitors any sort of litigation affecting
14 their Bureau takes over monitoring cases at
15 that point. And my role really at that
16 point is done.

17 Q. Who is the attorney who is
18 monitoring -- who is the Bureau attorney who
19 is monitoring this action?

20 A. Then?

21 Q. Then and now.

22 A. Well, then it was Cammie Chapman.

23 Q. If an acknowledgment was signed and
24 returned, would it have been sent to Cammie

1 Chapman, or would it have been sent to you?

2 A. Neither.

3 Q. Who would receive these return

4 acknowledgements?

5 A. Our paralegal.

6 Q. And who supervises your paralegal?

7 A. Me.

8 Q. You mentioned that you have

9 submitted litigation holds since -- well,

10 about 20 since 2017; is that right?

11 A. Give or take.

12 Q. Is this acknowledgement included on

13 all of the form litigation holds that you

14 send?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Do you know whether or not these

17 acknowledgements are typically signed and

18 returned?

19 A. We do not get a 100 percent return

20 rate typically.

21 Q. Who within the Department of Health

22 and Human Resources is responsible for

23 ensuring that discoverable documentation is

24 preserved in the pendency of litigation?

1 A. Can you define discoverable
2 documentation?

3 Q. Any documentation -- so, for
4 example, in our current lawsuit -- this case
5 involves the management of the foster care
6 system as a whole. Any documentation which
7 would pertain to the management or operation
8 of the foster care system, at least it would
9 be our contention, would be subject
10 potentially to discovery in this matter and
11 the purpose of this litigation hold.

12 When a litigation hold is issued,
13 who within the department is responsible for
14 ensuring that that litigation hold is
15 actually carried out and is actually
16 enforced?

17 A. It is up to each individual
18 receiving the litigation hold to manage
19 their own documents, be they paper documents
20 or documents on their computers. And OT
21 manages the email preservation.

22 Q. So would it be your position then
23 that follow-up with the Office of
24 Technology, if it were required, would be

1 the responsibility of the individuals
2 subject to the litigation hold and not your
3 office?

4 A. I'm sorry. Can you ask that again?

5 Q. Yes. So if follow-up with the
6 Office of Technology regarding a litigation
7 hold were needed, would that be the
8 responsibility of the individual that was
9 subject to that litigation hold, or would
10 that be the responsibility of General
11 Counsel's Office?

12 A. What do you mean by follow-up?

13 Q. Determining whether or not a
14 litigation hold was in fact in place at the
15 Office of Technology?

16 A. I had no reason to believe that the
17 litigation holds weren't in place at OT. So
18 it didn't -- why would follow-up be
19 necessary?

20 Q. Well, you just stated a moment ago
21 that you did not receive any signed
22 acknowledgements from the West Virginia
23 Office of Technology; is that right?

24 A. Correct.

1 Q. So if you didn't receive an
2 acknowledgement, or to the best of your
3 knowledge, no one did, why would you assume
4 that that litigation hold was put in place?

5 A. Because the sent email went
6 through. And they are in charge of email.

7 Q. But you don't know today whether or
8 not you received any confirmation from the
9 Office of Technology that these litigation
10 holds were received and implemented?

11 A. That's not true. I do know that OT
12 did not provide confirmation, those forms
13 you are pointing to there.

14 Q. And is it also your testimony today
15 that the Office of Technology did not
16 respond or confirm via email regarding their
17 receipt of a litigation hold?

18 MR. BROWN: Objection. Are you
19 asking what she knew at the time or what she
20 knows now?

21 MR. MEADE: I am asking what she
22 knew at the time.

23 A. Can you ask it again?

24 Q. I can.

1 So at the time -- or within 60 days
2 of these litigation holds being sent to the
3 Office of Technology, did you receive any
4 confirmation email or other communication
5 from the Office of Technology regarding
6 receipt of the hold?

7 A. I did not.

8 Q. Is it your testimony today that
9 prior to September of this year, you did not
10 know whether or not these litigation holds
11 were put in place by the Office of
12 Technology?

13 A. That is correct. I assumed they
14 were in place. I had been sending them
15 since 2017. And whoever was heading up OT
16 in each of those years never reached back to
17 say, hey, these memos are deficient in any
18 way.

19 Q. When these litigation holds are
20 sent - whether in this case or in other
21 cases where you have sent them - who
22 typically at the Office of Technology
23 receives them?

24 A. Whoever is the head of that agency

1 at the time.

2 Q. So would it be the chief
3 information officer that receives them?

4 A. I don't know what their exact
5 working title is.

6 Q. Okay. Now, are there any other
7 individuals within -- let me rephrase that.

8 Is there any other specific
9 position in the staff at the Office of
10 Technology that would be a recipient
11 directly from your office of a litigation
12 hold?

13 A. Now there is.

14 Q. Would that have been the case in
15 2019?

16 A. No.

17 Q. To the best of your knowledge, did
18 anyone at the Department of Health and Human
19 Resources follow up with the West Virginia
20 Office of Technology when named defendants
21 in this action, or other staff that were
22 subject to your litigation hold, departed
23 the agency, they left?

24 A. I believe it was discovered in

1 September that there was a problem with the
2 emails of those who had departed.

3 Q. But at the time of those particular
4 members of staff, employees of the
5 department -- at the time of their exit, to
6 the best of your knowledge, did anyone reach
7 out to the Office of Technology regarding
8 these litigation holds?

9 A. Not to my knowledge.

10 Q. Did anyone from your office in
11 particular reach out to the Office of
12 Technology regarding these litigation holds?

13 A. Not to my knowledge.

14 Q. Are you aware that in 2021, this
15 particular litigation was dismissed by the
16 District Court?

17 A. I will take your word for it.

18 Q. Well, were you aware in 2021 that
19 that occurred?

20 A. I probably was.

21 Q. All right. At the time of that
22 dismissal by the District Court, did anyone
23 from your office reach out to the Office of
24 Technology regarding the ongoing

1 enforceability of these litigation holds?

2 A. No.

3 Q. To the best of your knowledge, did
4 anyone at the Department of Health and Human
5 Resources reach out to the Office of
6 Technology regarding litigation holds for
7 this case?

8 A. No.

9 Q. Do you have any reason -- or can
10 you explain why that would be, why no one
11 would follow up with the Office of
12 Technology?

13 MR. BROWN: Objection. Can you
14 clarify what time frame you are talking
15 about?

16 Q. Specifically at the time of this
17 matter's dismissal by the District Court
18 judge, why would no one from your office
19 have reached out to the Office of Technology
20 to discuss these litigation holds?

21 A. Probably because dismissal at the
22 District Court level is not necessarily the
23 end of the litigation, as evidenced by the
24 fact that we are still here.

1 Q. Is that something that you would
2 expect employees at the Office of Technology
3 to be aware of?

4 A. No. Other than outside counsel has
5 been working throughout the pendency of this
6 matter on -- with folks from OT on
7 voluminous amounts of discovery.

8 Q. In your role as general counsel,
9 following your production and distribution
10 of this litigation hold, did you have any
11 discussions with any of the individuals
12 subject to the hold regarding their own
13 efforts to preserve electronically stored
14 information?

15 A. I did not.

16 Q. Are you capable of testifying here
17 today whether or not any of the named
18 individuals on your litigation hold took
19 independent action to preserve their own
20 electronically stored information?

21 A. I cannot.

22 Q. I am trying to think of the best
23 way to say this. Are individuals who are in
24 charge of the management of the department

1 or any of its various agencies issued cell
2 phones by the State of West Virginia?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Do any of the cell phones that were
5 issued to staff at the department who were
6 subject to this litigation hold -- do any of
7 those state-issued cell phones still exist?

8 A. I am not the person who retains
9 custody and control of state-issued
10 equipment.

11 Q. Who would be the person that
12 maintains custody and control of that
13 equipment?

14 A. It is my understanding that OT is
15 responsible for state-issued equipment in
16 terms of accessing what is on pieces of
17 equipment. But our Office of Management
18 Information Services I believe can take care
19 of those different devices.

20 Q. So you say that they can take care
21 of them. But is it that particular office
22 -- I think you said it was management -- I'm
23 sorry. I've lost it already. Management of
24 information -- I apologize. Do you mind

1 repeating what the name of that entity was?

2 A. Office of Management Information
3 Services.

4 Q. Office of Management Information
5 Services. Does that office maintain devices
6 that are distributed to state employees?

7 A. I believe so. But even they need
8 to be granted administrator access from OT
9 in order to log on, if you will, to do any
10 searching.

11 Q. Was that office, specifically of
12 Management Information Services, provided
13 with a litigation hold for this case?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. They were. Do you know who
16 specifically at that office was provided
17 with a litigation hold?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Would that have been Shawn Charles?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Do you know whether or not any
22 device that was issued to a state employee
23 who was subject to this litigation hold has
24 been preserved?

1 A. I don't know.

2 Q. Since discovering the issues
3 regarding purged emails by the Office of
4 Technology, has your office attempted to
5 reach out to the Management Information
6 Services or the Office of Technology
7 regarding preservation of devices such as
8 cell phones or laptops?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Based upon those conversations, can
11 you state whether or not any of those
12 devices have been preserved?

13 A. I believe there is at least one
14 computer that was maintained following an
15 employee's departure.

16 Q. Do you know which employee that
17 laptop belonged to?

18 A. Bill Crouch.

19 Q. Do you know whether or not Bill
20 Crouch had a state-issued cell phone?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Do you know whether or not that
23 state-issued cell phone has been preserved?

24 A. I do not know.

1 Q. When you say you don't know, are
2 you stating that the Office of Technology
3 or the Office of Information Services has
4 not affirmatively told you that they were
5 preserved?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Have they indicated to you that
8 they were not preserved?

9 A. They have not told me that either.

10 Q. Since this lawsuit has been
11 pending, there have been some change ups in
12 the administration at DHHR, specifically
13 with the exit of Secretary Crouch and Deputy
14 Secretary Jeremiah Samples, as well as other
15 individuals who were listed on your
16 litigation hold; is that correct?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. When incoming replacement staff,
19 let's say, such as Jeff Coben, took their
20 positions, were they provided with a
21 litigation hold?

22 A. Is your question solely about Jeff
23 Coben?

24 Q. It has to do with any incoming or

1 replacement supplemental staff that have
2 come in to fill the positions previously
3 held by individuals subject or at least
4 included within your litigation hold.

5 A. They were not given a litigation
6 hold for this matter.

7 Q. Why is that?

8 MR. BROWN: Are you asking about
9 any individual specifically?

10 Q. Just in particular, we can talk
11 about Jeff Coben. Why was Jeff Coben not
12 given a litigation hold with regard to this
13 matter?

14 A. His tenure with us was intended to
15 be temporarily -- temporary and brief. And
16 every week we talked to him about when his
17 departure date would be, and it was unknown.
18 And his involvement in minute details of
19 every pending case was extremely limited.
20 So it frankly did not occur to us to put him
21 on pre-existing litigation holds. As the
22 interim cabinet secretary at the time,
23 however, any new litigation holds that were
24 coming in, the cabinet secretary is always

1 included. So his name is on at least one.

2 Q. Just to clarify though. It is your
3 testimony here today that no one who has
4 come in to a position that was formerly
5 subject or is subject to this litigation
6 hold was sent with an updated litigation
7 hold upon taking those positions?

8 A. Not upon their taking those
9 positions.

10 Q. Prior to September of this year,
11 were any supplemental or replacement or
12 incoming staff taking the positions of
13 individuals who were subject to this
14 litigation hold sent a litigation hold?

15 A. No. For this case, no.

16 Q. So is it your testimony then today
17 that no supplementary litigation holds were
18 sent to anyone until the issue regarding ESI
19 preservation by the Office of Technology
20 became apparent?

21 A. Correct.

22 Q. Why did your office not send
23 litigation holds to non-temporary --
24 non-interim incoming staff?

1 A. The decision as to whether a
2 litigation hold is even issued in the first
3 place -- as I said earlier, I have issued
4 approximately 20, maybe a few more over the
5 last several years. Obviously, DHHR has
6 many more pending cases and settled cases in
7 those same years. A litigation hold isn't
8 issued for every case. That's a decision
9 that is made after discussion with
10 leadership and our outside defense counsel
11 and sometimes at the request of plaintiffs'
12 counsel.

13 Q. But it's your testimony that that
14 discussion regarding the necessity of the
15 litigation hold was had with regard to this
16 matter; is that correct?

17 A. In 2019.

18 Q. And upon the departure of
19 individuals who were subject to that
20 litigation hold, was there no additional
21 discussion about implementing that hold with
22 regard to incoming employees?

23 A. No.

24 Q. So is it your testimony here today

1 then that no one asked your office to issue
2 additional litigation holds to incoming
3 employees of the Department of Health and
4 Human Resources?

5 A. That's correct.

6 Q. How was the decision made regarding
7 which individuals would be subject to a
8 litigation hold and which would not?

9 A. As I recall, in this particular
10 case, there was a discussion with leadership
11 and perhaps outside counsel at the time, I
12 don't really remember, about including those
13 individuals with policy-making functions
14 over the Bureau for Children and Families
15 and/or supervisory roles with the field
16 operations. And that's how the individuals
17 on the 2019 litigation hold were determined.

18 Q. When individuals who were subject
19 to that litigation hold exited their
20 positions with the Department of Health and
21 Human Resources, to the best of your
22 knowledge, was there any sort of debrief
23 with them regarding preservation of their
24 electronically stored information?

1 A. I don't know.

2 Q. Do you know why individuals --
3 well, let me start over there. If I
4 indicated to you that electronically stored
5 information for Jane McCallister was at some
6 point produced in this case, would you have
7 any reason to disagree with that?

8 A. I wouldn't have any knowledge one
9 way or the other.

10 Q. Was Jane McCallister an individual
11 that was subject to the litigation hold that
12 you distributed in December of 2019?

13 A. I don't remember her name being on
14 the litigation hold, but I would have to
15 reference the document myself.

16 Q. Are all of the individuals that
17 were included on the litigation hold listed
18 on the document itself?

19 A. Can you ask that again?

20 Q. Yes. The document -- the
21 litigation hold that your office produced,
22 were all of the individuals who were subject
23 to that hold named within that document?

24 A. No. Because in the body of the

1 document itself, it instructs the recipients
2 that if they supervise or work with others
3 that they know may have responsive
4 information, that they are to share the
5 litigation hold or let them know about this
6 effort to preserve.

7 Q. Okay. To the best of your
8 knowledge, were any of the individuals named
9 within the litigation hold followed up with
10 regarding whether or not they provided this
11 document to individuals that they supervise?

12 A. I cannot answer that one way or
13 another. I assume, based on the amount of
14 discovery that has gone on in this
15 particular case that I was not privy to,
16 that all of those kind of conversations
17 likely may have taken place. But --

18 Q. But you don't know?

19 A. But I would not be the person with
20 firsthand knowledge of those conversations.

21 Q. So to just clarify then. You don't
22 know whether or not those sort of
23 conversations occurred?

24 A. No.

1 Q. So is it your statement here today
2 that this litigation hold was intended to
3 apply to individuals other than just those
4 who are specifically named on it?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. How would the West Virginia Office
7 of Technology know to preserve ESI for
8 individuals who were not listed on the
9 litigation hold that was provided to the
10 Office of Technology?

11 A. Unless during discovery our counsel
12 working with the folks at OT who were doing
13 the searching -- based on the discovery
14 requests and the search terms and the named
15 individuals, they may have known through
16 that one-on-one work.

17 Q. So is it your testimony then that
18 the Office of Technology would know about
19 other individuals subject to the hold if
20 they were told by someone other than your
21 office?

22 A. It would come up organically during
23 the discovery process, the names of the
24 individuals whose accounts were being

1 searched.

2 Q. Was the Office of Technology at any
3 point in time instructed to preserve
4 electronically stored information for all
5 individuals for whom discovery was produced
6 in this matter?

7 A. I don't know.

8 Q. Other than this litigation hold,
9 did the Department of Health and Human
10 Resources send anything to the Office of
11 Technology to preserve electronically stored
12 information?

13 A. Again, I am not involved in the
14 discovery process of this case or any other
15 case, so I can't say.

16 Q. But you were involved in the
17 production and distribution of the
18 litigation hold from 2019; is that correct?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. So did your office generate any
21 other documents regarding preservation of
22 electronically stored information that was
23 sent to the Office of Technology?

24 A. My office did not, other than at

1 the time Associate General Counsel Cammie
2 Chapman was also in my office, and she was
3 working closely with outside counsel on the
4 defense of this case.

5 Q. Do you know whether or not Cammie
6 Chapman provided a request or a directive to
7 the Office of Technology to preserve
8 electronically stored information for any
9 individual that is not listed on the 2019
10 litigation hold?

11 A. I don't believe that she did.

12 Q. If an individual leaves the
13 employment of the Department of Health and
14 Human Resources but remains an employee of
15 the state government of West Virginia, to
16 the best of your knowledge, would that
17 individual's accounts still be authorized
18 for deprovisioning, the same deprovisioning
19 that we have been discussing throughout this
20 deposition?

21 A. Their access to DHHR information
22 would be deprovisioned, but they might still
23 have a wv.gov email address. And I don't
24 know behind the scenes how OT differentiates

1 someone's access from one department to
2 another -- you know, when those transfers
3 occurred. Sometimes the person's email
4 address is altered slightly. I know of
5 particular cases where that has occurred.
6 OT assigns us our email addresses. We don't
7 get to choose.

8 Q. Okay.

9 A. So from my -- for example, mine is
10 April.L.Robertson@wv.gov. If I went to
11 another state agency, it might become just
12 April.Robertson@wv.gov with no middle
13 initial. I know of particular people who
14 have joined our organization that that has
15 happened to.

16 Q. Since discovering that information
17 was not preserved by the Office of
18 Technology in this case, have you had a
19 conversation with anyone within that office
20 regarding their 30-day deletion policy?

21 A. Yes. In recent months, yes.

22 Q. Who specifically have you spoken to
23 at the Office of Technology regarding that
24 policy?

1 A. Heather Abbott, Danielle Cox,
2 Jennelle Jones. Those are the three main
3 ones.

4 Q. Do you know, based upon your
5 conversations with those individuals
6 employed at the Office of Technology,
7 whether or not the policy of deleting
8 electronic information only applies to
9 individuals who are leaving employment by
10 the state government? Or does that policy
11 also apply to individuals who are simply
12 shifting to another position within state
13 government?

14 MR. BROWN: Objection. Outside
15 of the scope.

16 A. I don't know how OT differentiates
17 in those transfer situations.

18 Q. So then if the electronically
19 stored information of some of the
20 individuals listed within your litigation
21 hold still exists, despite them having left
22 employment by the department, you would not
23 know why it is that their information was
24 preserved?

1 A. I'm sorry. Can you ask that again?

2 Q. So do you know why the information
3 of some or an individual included in your
4 litigation hold would be preserved and
5 available despite them having left
6 employment by the DHHR?

7 MS. BROWN: Objection. Are you
8 inquiring about a specific person?

9 Q. I am specifically -- do you have
10 any idea why the electronic information of
11 Jeremiah Samples continues to exist despite
12 the fact that he has departed employment by
13 the Department of Health and Human
14 Resources?

15 A. I didn't know that it does.

16 Q. Do you know whether or not the
17 electronically stored information of any of
18 the named individuals on your litigation
19 hold continues to exist following their
20 departure from the department?

21 A. I believe it has been discovered
22 because of emails they sent to other people
23 who still work for the department. Those
24 other people may have received information

1 or emails from those departed people. So in
2 the To field, the From field, the cc field,
3 those email accounts can be recreated, if
4 you will.

5 Q. So it's your testimony then, at
6 least based upon your understanding of how
7 this electronic information is preserved,
8 that communications between X employees of
9 the department with current employees of the
10 department, that those sort of emails still
11 exist?

12 A. Sure.

13 Q. Do you know whether or not the
14 Office of Technology is also in charge of
15 things like voicemail or voice memos or
16 other communication that takes place
17 interagency within the state government?

18 A. On the telephone system?

19 Q. Yes.

20 A. I cannot answer that 100 percent.
21 I don't -- maybe. I don't know.

22 Q. Based upon the discussions that you
23 have had with the Office of Technology, do
24 you know whether or not they have performed

1 any search of either devices that were
2 provided to personnel who were subject to
3 the litigation hold or other means of
4 electronic communication since determining
5 that the emails in particular of these
6 individuals was purged?

7 A. I don't know what devices have been
8 searched.

9 Q. So then is it your testimony that
10 you have not had a conversation with the
11 Office of Technology regarding that
12 particular issue?

13 A. I believe Heather Abbott
14 communicated to us that it would be cost
15 prohibitive to maintain everything that is
16 on every device that's ever issued to a
17 state employee and that that is not their
18 custom -- you know, their practice.

19 Q. Is it your testimony today that
20 between December 4, 2019 -- and I will
21 represent to you that's the date on your
22 litigation hold -- and October of this year,
23 2023, you were not aware that anyone
24 followed up with the Office of Technology

1 regarding a litigation hold for this pending
2 case?

3 A. I believe there was some
4 communication between outside counsel and OT
5 in September regarding searching, you know,
6 through the discovery process. And
7 litigation holds may have been mentioned in
8 some of those conversations.

9 Q. Do you know whether any sort of
10 communication with the Office of Technology
11 regarding litigation holds has been had
12 between December of 2019 and September of
13 2023 -- so prior to September of 2023?

14 A. I don't have that information.

15 Q. Did anyone from the West Virginia
16 Attorney General's Office reach out to your
17 office or to you in particular between
18 December of 2019 and September of 2023
19 regarding these litigation holds?

20 A. Not that I can recall.

21 MR. MEADE: Let's take maybe
22 just a quick five minutes.

23 (Break in proceedings.)

24 BY MR. MEADE:

1 Q. Ms. Robertson, just continuing on.
2 I think I have only got a handful more
3 questions for you. We can all get about our
4 day.

5 So you testified earlier that you
6 have created a list of the individuals who
7 provided a response to the litigation hold
8 that you sent out in 2019; in this correct?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Why did you create that list?

11 A. To prepare for this deposition.

12 Q. Do you have that list?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Are you able to produce that list?
15 Are you willing to provide a copy of it?

16 A. Just the litigation hold with check
17 marks by their names, the ones who have
18 turned in -- yes.

19 Q. So it would be the individuals
20 listed on the 2019 litigation hold with
21 check marks next to their names?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Do you recall which individuals
24 would be indicated to have returned a

1 response?

2 A. Not without looking at the
3 reference document.

4 Q. Would you produce the list with the
5 check marks included on it?

6 MS. BROWN: We can do that
7 after.

8 MR. MEADE: Yes. It doesn't
9 have to be right now.

10 MS. BROWN: Yes.

11 MR. MEADE: But just at some
12 point. I just want to make sure that it is
13 still around.

14 Q. Now, in your 2019 litigation hold,
15 would you agree with me that there is
16 nothing within the body of that document
17 itself which would indicate to the Office of
18 Technology who in particular they should be
19 preserving electronically stored information
20 for?

21 A. I would not agree with that.

22 Q. Why would you not agree with that?

23 A. Because their names are on the
24 document.

1 Q. Does the document say that the
2 Office of Information -- or the Office of
3 Information Technology is supposed to
4 preserve the information of the individuals
5 included in the To line on this letter?

6 A. As a recipient included in the To
7 line, that recipient should have read the
8 entire memo and realized that preservation
9 was at the heart of the memo. And since OT
10 is in charge of our email accounts, I think
11 it's a reasonable inference.

12 Q. So then is it your testimony that
13 you would assume the Office of Technology
14 would know just because these individuals
15 are included in the To line on the
16 litigation hold?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And again -- I know we have gone
19 over this a couple of times. But you
20 personally have not had any follow-up
21 conversation prior to 2023 with the Office
22 of Technology regarding who should be
23 subject to this litigation hold?

24 A. Correct.

1 Q. Now, your office has also generated
2 a more recent memorandum and litigation hold
3 regarding this case; is that correct?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. And that was produced and
6 distributed in early October of this year?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Attached to that memorandum
9 regarding litigation hold, there is a list
10 of litigation -- it's called the October 10,
11 2023 Litigation Hold Distribution List. Are
12 you familiar with that list?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Why did you include a list with all
15 of these different named individuals in your
16 2023 litigation hold but not with your 2019
17 litigation hold?

18 A. Because the new list is two pages
19 long. And it just made sense to do it this
20 way.

21 Q. So then is it your statement today
22 that the intent of that list on the 2023
23 memorandum is the same as the To line in the
24 2019 --

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. -- litigation hold?

3 Why wasn't a litigation hold sent
4 in this case prior to December of 2019?

5 A. As I stated before, litigation
6 holds are not sent in every case. It is at
7 someone's request, either defense counsel,
8 plaintiffs' counsel -- for various reasons.
9 And we issued the litigation hold in
10 December of 2019 because we were asked to.

11 Q. And would that hold have been sent
12 out relatively close in time to when the
13 request was issued?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. Now, you provided some testimony
16 regarding Cammie Chapman's role in your
17 office at the time that this initial
18 litigation hold was sent out. Do you know
19 whether or not Cammie Chapman returned an
20 acknowledgement of this litigation hold?

21 A. She did.

22 Q. Do you know whether or not Cammie
23 Chapman -- as I believe at that time
24 assistant general counsel -- had any

1 follow-up conversation with anyone either on
2 the To line of the 2019 litigation hold or
3 the Office of Technology in general?

4 A. As the associate general counsel
5 assigned to the Bureau for Children and
6 Families at that time, I am sure she had
7 conversations with everybody in the To line
8 with the exception perhaps of OT. But that
9 would be speculation on my part.

10 Q. Would it have been Ms. Chapman's
11 responsibility as associate counsel to
12 ensure that this litigation hold was
13 discussed with the individuals who would be
14 subject to it?

15 MR. BROWN: Objection.

16 A. I think that -- you know, my role
17 is to send out the litigation holds at the
18 outset of litigation, or even prior to a
19 complaint being filed, you know, when we
20 receive in circuit court cases, for example,
21 notices of intent to sue. And then
22 management and monitoring of those
23 individual cases then is transferred to the
24 Bureau attorneys for whichever Bureau is

1 affected and our outside counsel. Sometimes
2 it's private firms such as this case or the
3 Attorney General's Office. It just depends.
4 And at that point, my role -- I step back
5 and let all of those people take over the
6 management and direction of the defense of
7 the case, including discovery.

8 Q. So then it's your testimony - just
9 to make sure I am clear - that once your
10 office issued this litigation hold, that
11 Ms. Chapman, as associate counsel for the
12 Bureau for Children and Families, would have
13 had more involvement in the management of
14 this case and anything to do with this
15 litigation hold from that point forward?

16 A. Yes. Cammie was more hands on than
17 I was.

18 Q. Okay. We talked at length earlier
19 about deprovisioning. And I understand
20 deprovisioning at this point essentially
21 just means cutting off access to individuals
22 who are leaving the employment of the
23 department in particular as it relates to
24 this case.

1 And you have stated that you have
2 had conversations with individuals from the
3 Office of Technology regarding their at
4 least prior policy of deleting outgoing
5 staff's electronically stored information
6 after 30 days.

7 Based upon your conversations with
8 the Office of Technology, is it your
9 understanding that upon receiving
10 authorization to deprovision exiting staff,
11 the policy that was in place to delete
12 electronically stored information was
13 triggered? Meaning that 30 days after that
14 authorization to deprovision was received,
15 these deletions would occur?

16 A. I have recently learned that that
17 is how OT was interpreting the deprovisions,
18 notwithstanding the previously issued
19 litigation holds for any particular
20 individuals. It was my understanding since
21 2017 that litigation holds would supercede
22 and take the place of any automated document
23 or electronic destruction of records.

24 Q. With regard to deprovisioning, when

1 an individual is leaving their position with
2 the department, who is in charge of issuing
3 authorization for that deprovision? Is that
4 always the cabinet secretary's office, the
5 administrative secretary as you previously
6 testified, or would it be someone else in a
7 supervisory role?

8 A. As you know, DHHR is a very large
9 agency. The secretary in the secretary's
10 office is not in charge of deprovisioning
11 any one of the 6500 plus or minus employees.
12 I don't know who are the other people
13 throughout the rest of the department who
14 may fill out that online fillable form that
15 OT asks state agencies to submit when an
16 employee leaves state employment.

17 Q. Okay. So you have previously
18 testified that your office is occasionally
19 involved with answering or reviewing the
20 questions filled out on the deprovisioning
21 form that is produced by the Office of
22 Technology; is that right?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. But your office -- would it be true

1 to say that your office is not involved in
2 the deprovisioning of all employees that
3 leave the Department of Health and Human
4 Resources?

5 A. Correct.

6 Q. If an individual were to leave
7 their position within one of the bureaus
8 underneath the big umbrella that is the
9 DHHR, would associate counsel for that
10 Bureau be involved in the filling out or
11 review of those deprovisioning forms?

12 A. No, not necessarily. It's a very
13 simple form, like three or four questions
14 max.

15 Q. To the best of your knowledge,
16 given your over a decade of experience
17 working for the department, are associate
18 general counsel ever involved in discussions
19 of authorization for deprovisioning exiting
20 staff?

21 A. No. It's an HR function primarily.

22 Q. Why is it that the general
23 counsel's office would be involved in some
24 situations but associate counsel would not

1 be involved with their relevant Bureaus?

2 A. I have been involved in the
3 deprovisioning of employees who worked for
4 me. That's the distinction. And the
5 cabinet secretary's secretary who
6 deprovisions those folks happens to be in
7 the suite of offices where my office is.
8 And I make sure that -- when I know one of
9 my people are leaving, I make sure she knows
10 this is the date, cut them off.

11 Q. So then your involvement with that
12 entire process is just limited to employees
13 of your office?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. In your role as general counsel, do
16 you have any knowledge whatsoever of how
17 that process is carried out and other
18 offices within the department?

19 A. No.

20 Q. You previously testified that, to
21 the best of your knowledge, one laptop
22 belonging to Bill Crouch has been preserved
23 when we were discussing devices that are
24 issued to state employees; is that right?

1 A. I said it was a computer.

2 Q. Okay. A computer.

3 How many devices that were issued
4 to state employees that were subject to this
5 litigation hold have been wiped or otherwise
6 destroyed?

7 A. I don't know.

8 Q. Are you aware of any devices that
9 were issued to state employees that were
10 subject to the 2019 litigation hold that
11 were destroyed?

12 A. I don't know.

13 Q. You also stated that currently the
14 state uses a chat messaging system through
15 Google; is that right?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. To the best of your knowledge, are
18 those chat messages being preserved as it
19 relates to individuals who are subject both
20 to the 2019 litigation hold and to the more
21 recent 2023 litigation hold produced by your
22 office?

23 A. They should be right along with
24 emails. When you open up your email

1 function, the chat function also opens up.

2 Q. Okay. Have you had -- I apologize.

3 A. It's just the executive branch
4 agencies who are in the Google domain now.
5 Not all state employees are using Google.

6 Q. Have you had any conversations with
7 the Office of Technology about preservation
8 of those Google chat messages?

9 A. No.

10 Q. Ms. Robertson, I think I just have
11 one more question for you. And it is really
12 just to clarify you and your office's
13 involvement with the preservation of
14 evidence in this case. I guess it's
15 actually broken up into a couple of
16 questions.

17 So it's your testimony here today
18 that the sole involvement that you or your
19 office has had with regard to preservation
20 of ESI in this case was issuing the 2019
21 litigation hold that we have been discussing
22 and the now 2023 litigation hold that was
23 recently distributed; is that correct?

24 A. And we have had some conversations

1 with OT over October and November just about
2 process, our understanding versus their
3 understanding --

4 Q. Okay.

5 A. -- as it relates to litigation
6 holds in general.

7 Q. Okay. And now I believe it has
8 also been your testimony that neither
9 yourself nor to the best of your knowledge
10 anyone within your office had any sort of
11 follow-up conversations with the Office of
12 Technology regarding this litigation hold
13 between December of 2019 and September of
14 2023; is that correct?

15 A. Our attorneys on our behalf have
16 worked a lot with people at OT to -- as part
17 of the discovery process.

18 Q. I am asking whether or not any --
19 whether you yourself or anyone directly
20 within your office has had any sort of
21 follow-up communication within that time
22 period?

23 A. No.

24 MR. MEADE: Okay. Let's take

1 one last quick break. And I promise we will
2 try to get this wrapped up.

3 (Break in proceedings.)

4 BY MR. MEADE:

5 Q. Ms. Robertson -- so getting back
6 into this -- you have just testified that at
7 least to the best of your knowledge, no one
8 from your office in particular, neither
9 yourself or someone directly employed within
10 your office, has or had a communication with
11 the Office of Technology between December of
12 2019 and September of this year; is that
13 right?

14 A. Not to my knowledge.

15 Q. Okay. And it's also your testimony
16 that you assumed when these litigation holds
17 were emailed, that they were received,
18 understood and implemented; is that correct?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. When individuals have left the
21 employment of the department, individuals
22 specifically subject to the 2019 litigation
23 hold, was anyone responsible for following
24 up with the Office of Technology to ensure

1 that their electronic information would be
2 preserved?

3 A. No. Because the language of the
4 litigation hold is clear.

5 Q. So it's your position that nobody
6 had that responsibility?

7 A. It's my position that that was not
8 necessary. Because the language of the
9 litigation hold is clear.

10 Q. Would you agree with me that given
11 that large amounts of this electronically
12 stored information were not preserved, that
13 the letter itself may not have been
14 sufficiently clear?

15 MS. BROWN: Objection. Calls
16 for a legal conclusion.

17 A. I can't speak for the
18 misunderstanding on OT's part.

19 Q. Do you have any sense of -- if
20 there was someone who should have followed
21 up with the Office of Technology upon the
22 departure of staff subject to this hold, who
23 would have had that responsibility?

24 MS. BROWN: Objection. Calls

1 for speculation.

2 A. The word "responsibility," I am not
3 willing to place that on anyone because of
4 everything I have previously stated. And I
5 should say -- just so that we are clear
6 about who you believe to be in my office
7 when you say did anyone reach out or discuss
8 with OT -- I have stated that I know outside
9 counsel did. I don't know about anybody
10 like Cammie for instance. But I believe
11 that Shawn Charles -- who is in DHHR, but
12 not necessarily in my office -- had multiple
13 conversations throughout the pendency of
14 this litigation with various individuals at
15 OT at various times.

16 Q. Have you spoken with Mr. Charles
17 about this yourself?

18 A. No, not -- when you say "this," can
19 you be more specific?

20 Q. Have you spoken with Mr. Charles
21 regarding communications he would have had
22 with the Office of Technology following the
23 distribution of the 2019 litigation hold?

24 A. No. But I have seen emails.

1 Q. Okay. And again, just to be clear,
2 it's your testimony here today that the 2019
3 litigation hold that was distributed by your
4 office was intended to apply to individuals
5 other than those specifically named within
6 that document; is that correct?

7 A. Yes. There is a paragraph in there
8 that says, to the named individuals, if you
9 supervise or have any other people in your
10 office who may have subject matter documents
11 related to the subject matter of this case,
12 then you need to inform them of the need to
13 preserve.

14 Q. So it's your position here today
15 then that it was the responsibility of these
16 individuals named within the document to
17 inform the Office of Technology about anyone
18 else under their supervision who should have
19 been subject to this hold?

20 A. That's not what I said. It was
21 their responsibility to talk to the people
22 that reported to them about their need to
23 preserve.

24 Q. So would anyone have been

1 responsible for informing the Office of
2 Technology about individuals who are not
3 named in this document?

4 A. We have been working on our process
5 since this all came to light internally.
6 And I know OT has been working on their
7 process. We have been working together to
8 have a better understanding of the steps
9 necessary to ensure preservation. And
10 moving forward, we will be having additional
11 safeguards in place.

12 Q. So then is it your testimony that
13 nobody was responsible for informing the
14 Office of Technology about individuals who
15 should be subject to this litigation hold
16 but are not named within it?

17 A. It's my testimony that to my
18 knowledge no one -- say perhaps Shawn
19 Charles in some of his email communications
20 with OT -- discussed the ongoing litigation
21 hold that was in place.

22 Q. So then to the best of your
23 knowledge, no one communicated to the Office
24 of Technology to preserve electronically

1 stored information for anyone outside of the
2 individuals who are specifically named in
3 your 2019 litigation hold?

4 A. That is fair to say.

5 MR. MEADE: I don't believe I
6 have any more questions. Thank you,
7 Ms. Robertson. I appreciate you coming
8 down.

9 MR. WALTERS: Hold on a second.
10 She may have some questions.

11 MR. MEADE: I suppose that is
12 true. I assumed no.

13 MS. BROWN: No. We have no
14 questions. But we do reserve the right to
15 read and sign.

16 MR. MEADE: I believe the only
17 additional thing here is, we would like to
18 reserve the right to re-depose this witness
19 following the potential deposition of a
20 member of the Office of Technology.

21 (Deposition concluded at 10:45 a.m.)

22 * * * * *

23

24

CERTIFICATE

I, Tara Arthur, Certified Stenotype Reporter and Notary Public, do hereby certify that the foregoing deposition of the above-named witness, was duly taken by me in machine shorthand, and that the same were accurately written out in full and reduced to computer transcription.

I further certify that I am neither attorney or counsel for, nor related to or employed by any of the parties to the action in which this deposition is taken; and furthermore, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto or financially interested in the action.

My commission expires April 16, 2027.



Tara Arthur
Certified Court Reporter/Notary Public

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | 3 | 24:2,10,14,20 25:2,9 26:12 29:2 58:20 | 13,19 18:6 19:12 23:19 | April.I. robertson@ wv.gov. 48:10 |
| 10 57:10 | 30 18:14 61:6, 13 | acknowledge ments 24:6 26:4,17 28:22 | affiliated 6:6 | April. robertson@ wv.gov 48:12 |
| 100 26:19 51:20 | 30-day 48:20 | acknowledgm ent 25:23 | affirmatively 38:4 | asks 62:15 |
| 10:45 73:21 | 3991 23:20 | act 12:20 | agencies 13:20 20:23 21:12 35:1 62:15 66:4 | aspect 6:16 |
| 12 6:18 | 4 | action 11:23 25:19 31:21 34:19 | agency 30:24 31:23 48:11 62:9 | assigned 59:5 |
| 17th 10:8 | 4 52:20 | additional 41:20 42:2 72:10 73:17 | agree 55:15, 21,22 69:10 | assigns 48:6 |
| 2 | 6 | address 47:23 48:4 | alter 8:10 | assistant 6:13,21 9:12 58:24 |
| 20 7:18,20 26:10 41:4 | 60 30:1 | addresses 17:13 48:6 | altered 48:4 | associate 47:1 59:4,11 60:11 63:9, 17,24 |
| 2017 7:23 8:1, 21 26:10 30:15 61:21 | 6500 62:11 | administratio n 38:12 | amount 44:13 | assume 18:3 19:21 29:3 44:13 56:13 |
| 2019 6:1,8 19:17 22:7 31:15 41:17 42:17 43:12 46:18 47:9 52:20 53:12, 18 54:8,20 55:14 57:16, 24 58:4,10 59:2 65:10,20 66:20 67:13 68:12,22 70:23 71:2 73:3 | A | administrativ e 12:4 13:14 14:7 16:8 62:5 | amounts 34:7 69:11 | assumed 30:13 68:16 73:12 |
| 2021 32:14,18 | a.m. 73:21 | administrator 36:8 | and/or 42:15 | Attached 57:8 |
| 2023 52:23 53:13,18 56:21 57:11, 16,22 65:21 66:22 67:14 | Abbott 49:1 52:13 | admission 5:13 | answering 17:2 62:19 | attempted 37:4 |
| | access 12:18, 19,21 14:23 17:6 21:2,9, 17,21 36:8 47:21 48:1 60:21 | admissibility 5:13 | answers 4:24 12:8 16:22 | attorney 5:11 20:1,5,10 23:14 25:12, 17,18 53:16 60:3 |
| | accessing 35:16 | affected 8:13 60:1 | apologize 35:24 66:2 | attorneys 59:24 67:15 |
| | account 14:4 | affecting 25:13 | apparent 40:20 | |
| | accounts 10:22 12:18 14:23 45:24 47:17 51:3 56:10 | affidavit 10:9, | applies 49:8 | |
| | acknowledge ment 23:22 | | apply 45:3 49:11 71:4 | |
| | | | approximatel y 41:4 | |
| | | | April 4:1,10 | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| audible 5:1 | big 63:8 | call 23:18 | cell 35:1,4,7 37:8,20,23 | 23 39:11 |
| authorization 14:4 15:2 61:10,14 62:3 63:19 | Bill 37:18,19 64:22 | called 4:2 10:14 57:10 | change 38:11 | commissioner 14:1 |
| authorization s 15:11 | body 43:24 55:16 | Calls 69:15, 24 | Chapman 25:22 26:1 47:2,6 58:19, 23 60:11 | commissioners 13:22 |
| authorized 14:20 16:14 47:17 | branch 20:23 21:11 66:3 | Cammie 25:22,24 47:1,5 58:16, 19,22 60:16 70:10 | Chapman's 58:16 59:10 | communicated 52:14 72:23 |
| authorizes 10:21 | break 5:8,16 53:23 68:1,3 | capable 34:16 | charge 29:6 34:24 51:14 56:10 62:2,10 | communication 19:10 20:9,18 21:22 30:4 51:16 52:4 53:4,10 67:21 68:10 |
| automated 61:22 | breaks 5:9 | capacity 4:16 6:20 | Charles 36:19 70:11, 16,20 72:19 | communications 51:8 70:21 72:19 |
| aware 9:8 15:9 16:16 18:12,17,21 19:5 32:14,18 34:3 52:23 65:8 | broken 66:15 | cards 12:19 | chat 20:20,24 22:3,4 65:14, 18 66:1,8 | complaint 59:19 |
| | BROWN 16:18 17:10 21:19 22:1 29:18 33:13 39:8 49:14 50:7 55:6,10 59:15 69:15, 24 73:13 | care 5:18 14:17 27:5,8 35:18,20 | check 54:16, 21 55:5 | completed 16:2 |
| | buildings 12:19 | carried 27:15 64:17 | chief 18:6 31:2 | computer 37:14 65:1,2 |
| B | Bureau 8:13 13:21 14:2,16 25:12,14,18 42:14 59:5,24 60:12 63:10 | case 8:11 10:11 14:21 18:10 20:7 23:21 27:4 30:20 31:14 33:7 36:13 39:19 40:15 41:8 42:10 43:6 44:15 46:14,15 47:4 48:18 53:2 57:3 58:4,6 60:2,7,14,24 66:14,20 71:11 | Children 14:2,16 42:14 59:5 60:12 | computers 27:20 |
| back 8:20 30:16 60:4 68:5 | bureaus 63:7 64:1 | cases 25:14 30:21 41:6 48:5 59:20,23 | choose 48:7 | concluded 73:21 |
| based 37:10 44:13 45:13 49:4 51:6,22 61:7 | C | | circuit 59:20 | conclusion 69:16 |
| basic 4:23 | | | clarify 33:14 40:2 44:21 66:12 | conducted 20:11 |
| begun 8:20 | cabinet 10:20 11:5,10 13:11,16 14:8 21:16,21,23 39:22,24 62:4 64:5 | | clear 60:9 69:4,9,14 70:5 71:1 | conducting 23:10 |
| behalf 67:15 | | | close 58:12 | confirm 29:16 |
| belonged 37:17 | | | closely 47:3 | confirmation 29:8,12 30:4 |
| belonging 64:22 | | | Coben 38:19, | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| contact 7:7 20:6 | counsel 4:18 5:22 6:3,12, 13,14,20,21, 22,23 7:9 8:3 9:11,13 11:17 19:5,24 23:15,16 34:4,8 41:10, 12 42:11 45:11 47:1,3 53:4 58:7,8, 24 59:4,11 60:1,11 63:9, 18,24 64:15 70:9 | cutting 17:5 60:21 | definition 17:8 | depending 8:10 |
| contention 27:9 | | <hr/> D <hr/> | delete 61:11 | depends 60:3 |
| Continue 5:14 | | Danielle 49:1 | deleting 18:13 49:7 61:4 | deposed 4:11 |
| continues 50:11,19 | | date 12:15 39:17 52:21 64:10 | deletion 18:22 48:20 | deposition 4:14 23:10 47:20 54:11 73:19,21 |
| continuing 54:1 | | day 54:4 | deletions 61:15 | deprovision 15:12 16:13 61:10,14 62:3 |
| control 35:9, 12 | | days 18:14 30:1 61:6,13 | delivery 22:8 | deprovisione |
| conversation 5:16 48:19 52:10 56:21 59:1 | counsel's 10:2 11:13 17:21 28:11 63:23 | debrief 42:22 | departed 17:20 31:22 32:2 50:12 51:1 | d 11:8 12:17 14:13 16:11 47:22 |
| conversation s 25:7 37:10 44:16,20,23 49:5 53:8 59:7 61:2,7 66:6,24 67:11 70:13 | couple 4:23 56:19 66:15 | December 19:17 43:12 52:20 53:12, 18 58:4,10 67:13 68:11 | departing 11:6,7 17:5 | deprovisionin g 10:14,21 11:14,17,21 12:10,20,24 13:6,10 14:5, 20 15:3 16:6, 10,14,20 17:3,12 47:18 60:19,20 61:24 62:10, 20 63:2,11,19 64:3 |
| copy 25:4 54:15 | court 4:3 5:1 32:16,22 33:17,22 59:20 | decision 21:10 41:1,8 42:6 | department 5:20 6:7,17, 24 7:22 8:12 9:20 13:6,20 15:14 16:3 17:20 21:16 26:21 27:13 31:18 32:5 33:4 34:24 35:5 42:3,20 46:9 47:13 48:1 49:22 50:13,20,23 51:9,10 60:23 62:2,13 63:3, 17 64:18 68:21 | deprovisions 11:5 61:17 64:6 |
| correct 8:2 9:4,5 10:11, 24 11:3 13:12 14:9 19:7 28:24 30:13 38:16 40:21 41:16 42:5 46:18 54:8 56:24 57:3 63:5 66:23 67:14 68:18 71:6 | Cox 49:1 | decisions 11:20 12:2 | departure 12:16 37:15 39:17 41:18 50:20 69:22 | deputy 13:18, 21 38:13 |
| create 54:10 | create 54:10 | defendants 11:22 14:19 17:17 31:20 | | designation 21:8 |
| created 54:6 | Crouch 37:18,20 38:13 64:22 | Defendants' 18:9 19:14 | | destroyed 65:6,11 |
| current 5:19 27:4 51:9 | custody 35:9, 12 | defense 41:10 47:4 58:7 60:6 | | destruction 61:23 |
| custom 52:18 | cut 12:18 64:10 | deficient 30:17 | | |
| cost 52:14 | | define 16:20 18:19 27:1 | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| detail 5:6,19 7:12 | discovered 31:24 50:21 | distribution 34:9 46:17 57:11 70:23 | electronically 8:22 9:15,21 17:23 18:23 34:13,20 42:24 43:4 46:4,11,22 47:8 49:18 50:17 55:19 61:5,12 69:11 72:24 | 21:4,5 32:4 34:2 36:6 41:22 42:3 51:8,9 62:11 63:2 64:3,12, 24 65:4,9 66:5 |
| details 39:18 | discovering 37:2 48:16 | District 32:16,22 33:17,22 | email 10:22 20:11,18 22:7,10,11, 12,16,18 27:21 29:5,6, 16 30:4 47:23 48:3,6 51:3 56:10 65:24 72:19 | employment 17:20 19:1 47:13 49:9,22 50:6,12 60:22 62:16 68:21 |
| determine 8:13 24:20 | discovery 7:4 8:16 9:3 23:9 27:10 34:7 44:14 45:11, 13,23 46:5,14 53:6 60:7 67:17 | docket 23:20 | emailed 68:17 | end 33:23 |
| determined 42:17 | discuss 8:11 10:13 33:20 70:7 | document 23:19 43:15, 18,20,23 44:1,11 55:3, 16,24 56:1 61:22 71:6,16 72:3 | emails 18:13 22:12 23:7,14 32:2 37:3 50:22 51:1,10 52:5 65:24 70:24 | enforceability 33:1 |
| determines 11:7 21:8 | discussed 59:13 72:20 | documentatio n 8:17 26:23 27:2,3,6 | employed 7:21 49:6 68:9 | enforced 27:16 |
| determining 28:13 52:4 | discussing 47:19 64:23 66:21 | documents 7:5 27:19,20 46:21 71:10 | employee 36:22 37:16 47:14 52:17 62:16 | ensure 17:22 59:12 68:24 72:9 |
| device 36:22 52:16 | discussion 41:9,14,21 42:10 | domain 66:4 | employee's 12:15 17:5 37:15 | ensuring 26:23 27:14 |
| devices 35:19 36:5 37:7,12 52:1, 7 64:23 65:3, 8 | discussions 11:20 12:2 19:21 20:3 34:11 51:22 63:18 | doubt 21:20 | employees 10:15 11:6,8, 12 13:15,17 | entire 19:4 56:8 64:12 |
| DHHR 6:3 24:23 25:3 38:12 41:5 47:21 50:6 62:8 63:9 70:11 | dismissal 32:22 33:17, 21 | downloaded 15:17 | | entirety 6:3 |
| differentiates 47:24 49:16 | dismissed 32:15 | duly 4:2 | | entity 36:1 |
| direction 60:6 | distinction 64:4 | <hr/> E <hr/> | | entries 23:20 |
| directive 47:6 | distributed 9:20 36:6 43:12 57:6 66:23 71:3 | earlier 41:3 54:5 60:18 | | equipment 35:10,13,15, 17 |
| directly 31:11 67:19 68:9 | | early 57:6 | | ESI 9:9 10:11 40:18 45:7 66:20 |
| directors 13:19 | | effort 44:6 | | essentially 60:20 |
| disagree 43:7 | | efforts 34:13 | | evidence 66:14 |
| discoverable 26:23 27:1 | | electronic 49:8 50:10 51:7 52:4 61:23 69:1 | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| evidenced 33:23 | | firsthand 44:20 | | |
| exact 31:4 | F | folks 19:22 24:23 34:6 45:12 64:6 | G | H |
| EXAMINATION 4:5 | fact 28:14 33:24 50:12 | follow 8:8 17:21 31:19 33:11 | general 5:22 6:2,12,13,14, 20,21,23 7:9 8:3 9:11,13 10:1 11:13,16 12:10 17:21 19:5 28:10 34:8 47:1 58:24 59:3,4 63:18,22 64:15 67:6 | hand 5:2 |
| exception 59:8 | fair 73:4 | follow-up 19:9 25:6 27:23 28:5, 12,18 56:20 59:1 67:11,21 | | handful 54:2 |
| excuse 16:10 | fairly 7:19 | | | handle 5:16 |
| executive 20:23 21:11 66:3 | familiar 10:17 11:9 20:19 57:12 | | | hands 60:16 |
| exhibit 18:8 19:13 23:18 | Families 14:2,16 42:14 59:6 60:12 | form 12:3,12, 22,23 13:1,6, 10 15:20 16:2 17:11 26:13 62:14,21 63:13 | General's 20:2,5,10 23:14 53:16 60:3 | happened 48:15 |
| exist 9:24 35:7 50:11,19 51:11 | feature 20:24 22:3,4 | forms 15:12 16:6 29:12 63:11 | generate 46:20 | head 30:24 |
| existed 10:5 | federal 23:21 | forward 60:15 72:10 | generated 13:10 57:1 | heading 30:15 |
| existence 13:7 | feel 5:4 | foster 27:5,8 | gestures 5:3 | Health 5:20 6:7,17,24 21:17 26:21 31:18 33:4 42:3,20 46:9 47:13 50:13 63:3 |
| exists 49:21 | field 42:15 51:2 | frame 33:14 | give 7:12 26:11 | heart 56:9 |
| exit 32:5 38:13 | fields 16:9 | frankly 39:20 | Google 20:24 21:6,9,13 65:15 66:4,5, 8 | Heather 49:1 52:13 |
| exited 13:5 14:3 42:19 | filed 59:19 | free 5:4 | government 47:15 49:10, 13 51:17 | held 39:3 |
| exiting 61:10 63:19 | fill 15:21 16:9 39:2 62:14 | full 4:8 | granted 36:8 | hey 30:17 |
| expect 34:2 | fillable 12:3, 12 15:12,20 16:6 17:11 62:14 | function 63:21 66:1 | group 22:12, 14 | highly 13:15, 17 |
| experience 8:19 63:16 | filled 13:13 14:6 62:20 | functions 42:13 | guess 20:17 66:14 | hit 15:21 |
| explain 11:2 33:10 | filling 63:10 | | | hold 7:16 8:1, 5,8,14,15 13:4 17:19 19:9,16 20:7 22:6,23 23:7, 17 24:4,7,16 25:2,8 27:11, 12,14,18 28:2,7,9,14 29:4,17 30:6 |
| extent 12:1 | fills 12:5 | | | |
| extremely 39:19 | final 23:22 | | | |
| | fine 5:9 17:8 | | | |
| | firms 60:2 | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| 31:12,22 34:10,12,18 35:6 36:13, 17,23 38:16, 21 39:4,6,12 40:6,7,14 41:2,7,15,20, 21 42:8,17,19 43:11,14,17, 21,23 44:5,9 45:2,9,19 46:8,18 47:10 49:21 50:4,19 52:3,22 53:1 54:7,16,20 55:14 56:16, 23 57:2,9,11, 16,17 58:2,3, 9,11,18,20 59:2,12 60:10,15 65:5,10,20,21 66:21,22 67:12 68:23 69:4,9,22 70:23 71:3,19 72:15,21 73:3,9 holds 7:14 8:20 17:14 20:3 26:9,13 28:17 29:10 30:2,10,19 32:8,12 33:1, 6,20 39:21,23 40:17,23 42:2 53:7,11,19 58:6 59:17 61:19,21 67:6 68:16 HR 63:21 | Human 5:20 6:7,17,24 21:17 26:22 31:18 33:4 42:4,21 46:9 47:14 50:13 63:3 <hr/> I <hr/> idea 7:15 50:10 implemented 29:10 68:18 implementing 41:21 In-person 22:8 inboxes 24:18 include 57:14 included 22:13 26:12 39:4 40:1 43:17 50:3 55:5 56:5,6, 15 including 42:12 60:7 incoming 9:12 38:18,24 40:12,24 41:22 42:2 independent 34:19 individual 22:12 27:17 28:8 39:9 | 43:10 47:9,12 50:3 59:23 62:1 63:6 individual's 47:17 individuals 13:18 17:18 22:22 23:1 24:6 25:3,7 28:1 31:7 34:11,18,23 38:15 39:3 40:13 41:19 42:7,13,16,18 43:2,16,22 44:8,11 45:3, 8,15,19,24 46:5 49:5,9, 11,20 50:18 52:6 54:6,19, 23 56:4,14 57:15 59:13 60:21 61:2,20 65:19 68:20, 21 70:14 71:4,8,16 72:2,14 73:2 inference 56:11 inform 71:12, 17 information 8:23 9:16,22 10:22 17:23 18:7,23 31:3 34:14,20 35:18,24 36:2,4,12 37:5 38:3 42:24 43:5 | 44:4 46:4,12, 22 47:8,21 48:16 49:8, 19,23 50:2, 10,17,24 51:7 53:14 55:19 56:2,3,4 61:5, 12 69:1,12 73:1 informing 72:1,13 inherited 8:9 initial 48:13 58:17 inquiring 50:8 Inspector 6:14 instance 70:10 instant 21:1 instructed 46:3 instructs 44:1 intended 22:9,13 39:14 45:2 71:4 intent 57:22 59:21 interagency 51:17 interim 6:12, 21 39:22 internally 72:5 | interoffice 20:18 interpreting 61:17 involve 11:12 involved 4:13 6:16,19 7:2,3 9:3 11:14,19 12:1 20:2 46:13,16 62:19 63:1, 10,18,23 64:1,2 involvement 7:13 8:16 10:10 39:18 60:13 64:11 66:13,18 involves 27:5 involving 11:21 issue 7:24 8:11 9:6 23:9 40:18 42:1 52:12 issued 8:15 27:12 35:1,5 36:22 41:2,3, 8 52:16 58:9, 13 60:10 61:18 64:24 65:3,9 issues 8:21 37:2 issuing 8:5, 20 62:2 66:20 |
|---|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| J | large 9:20 62:8 69:11 | litigation 6:4, 23 7:14,16 8:1,5,8,14,20 13:4 17:14,19 19:9,16,23 20:3,7 22:6, 23 23:7,17 24:4,7 25:2,8, 13 26:9,13,24 27:11,12,14, 18 28:2,6,9, 14,17 29:4,9, 17 30:2,10,19 31:11,22 32:8,12,15 33:1,6,20,23 34:10,18 35:6 36:13,17,23 38:16,21 39:4,5,12,21, 23 40:5,6,14, 17,23 41:2,7, 15,20 42:2,8, 17,19 43:11, 14,17,21 44:5,9 45:2,9 46:8,18 47:10 49:20 50:4,18 52:3,22 53:1, 7,11,19 54:7, 16,20 55:14 56:16,23 57:2,9,10,11, 16,17 58:2,3, 5,9,18,20 59:2,12,17,18 60:10,15 61:19,21 65:5,10,20,21 66:21,22 67:5,12 68:16,22 69:4,9 70:14, | 23 71:3 72:15,20 73:3 | manages 27:21 |
| Jane 43:5,10 | lawsuit 27:4 38:10 | | log 36:9 | marks 54:17, 21 55:5 |
| Jeff 38:19,22 39:11 | leadership 8:12 19:22 41:10 42:10 | | long 5:23 6:15 57:19 | matter 13:4 14:19 17:18 19:23 27:10 34:6 39:6,13 41:16 46:6 71:10,11 |
| Jennelle 49:2 | learned 61:16 | | looked 16:7 | matter's 33:17 |
| Jeremiah 38:14 50:11 | leave 63:3,6 | | lost 35:23 | max 63:14 |
| joined 48:14 | leaves 14:22 47:12 62:16 | | lot 67:16 | Mccallister 43:5,10 |
| Jones 49:2 | leaving 49:9 60:22 62:1 64:9 | | Lower 13:22 | MEADE 4:6 16:23 29:21 53:21,24 55:8,11 67:24 68:4 73:5,11, 16 |
| judge 33:18 | left 31:23 49:21 50:5 68:20 | | Lynn 4:10 | Meaning 61:13 |
| K | legal 69:16 | | M | means 12:17 20:12,13 52:3 60:21 |
| kind 44:16 | length 60:18 | | made 21:10 41:9 42:6 57:19 | member 73:20 |
| knew 29:19, 22 | let all 60:5 | | mail 22:8 | members 13:7 32:4 |
| knowledge 9:1,18,23 14:18 29:3 31:17 32:6,9, 13 33:3 42:22 43:8 44:8,20 47:16 63:15 64:16,21 65:17 67:9 68:7,14 72:18,23 | letter 56:5 69:13 | | main 49:2 | memo 56:8,9 |
| | level 9:7 33:22 | | maintain 36:5 52:15 | memorandum 57:2,8,23 |
| | light 72:5 | | maintained 37:14 | memos 30:17 51:15 |
| | limited 39:19 64:12 | | maintains 35:12 | mentioned 26:8 53:7 |
| L | Linda 14:2 | | make 24:3,23 55:12 60:9 64:8,9 | |
| language 69:3,8 | list 23:3,4 54:6,10,12,14 55:4 57:9,11, 12,14,18,22 | | making 24:24 | |
| laptop 37:17 64:21 | listed 38:15 43:17 45:8 47:9 49:20 54:20 | | manage 27:18 | |
| laptops 37:8 | | | management 27:5,7 34:24 35:17,22,23 36:2,4,12 37:5 59:22 60:6,13 | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| message 21:1 | 14:19 17:17 31:20 34:17 43:23 44:8 45:4,14 50:18 57:15 71:5,8, 16 72:3,16 73:2 | <hr/> O <hr/> | 33:5,11,18,19 34:2 35:17,21 36:2,4,5,11, 16 37:3,4,6 38:2,3 40:19, 22 42:1 43:21 45:6,10,18,21 46:2,10,20, 23,24 47:2,7 48:17,19,23 49:6 51:14,23 52:11,24 53:10,16,17 55:17 56:2, 13,21 57:1 58:17 59:3 60:3,10 61:3, 8 62:4,10,18, 21,24 63:1,23 64:7,13 65:22 66:7,19 67:10,11,20 68:8,10,11,24 69:21 70:6, 12,22 71:4, 10,17 72:1, 14,23 73:20 | open 65:24 opens 66:1 operation 27:7 operations 42:16 Opposition 19:14 order 36:9 organically 45:22 organization 48:14 OT 12:14 13:8,15 15:8 20:22 27:20 28:17 29:11 30:15 34:6 35:14 36:8 45:12 47:24 48:6 49:16 53:4 56:9 59:8 61:17 62:15 67:1,16 70:8,15 72:6, 20 OT's 13:2 69:18 outgoing 10:23 11:21 17:14 61:4 outset 59:18 |
| messages 65:18 66:8 | names 45:23 54:17,21 55:23 | objection 16:19 21:19 22:1 29:18 33:13 49:14 50:7 59:15 69:15,24 | 58:17 59:3 60:3,10 61:3, 8 62:4,10,18, 21,24 63:1,23 64:7,13 65:22 66:7,19 67:10,11,20 68:8,10,11,24 69:21 70:6, 12,22 71:4, 10,17 72:1, 14,23 73:20 | |
| messaging 65:14 | nature 18:14 | objects 5:12 | office's 66:12 | |
| Microsoft 21:12 | necessarily 33:22 63:12 70:12 | occasionally 62:18 | officer 18:7 31:3 | |
| middle 48:12 | needed 28:7 | occur 39:20 61:15 | offices 64:7, 18 | |
| mind 24:22 35:24 | network 20:22 | occurred 14:5 32:19 44:23 48:3,5 | one-on-one 45:16 | |
| mine 48:9 | necessity 41:14 | occurring 16:17 | ongoing 8:16 32:24 72:20 | |
| minus 62:11 | nods 5:2 | October 52:22 57:6,10 67:1 | online 12:3, 12 20:20 62:14 | |
| minute 39:18 | non-interim 40:24 | office 6:14 7:8,17 8:3,24 10:2 11:4,10, 12,13 12:5,13 13:11,16 14:7,9 15:1,7, 15 16:12 17:21,22 18:7,12,21 19:10 20:2,6, 10 21:12 23:14 24:11, 15 27:23 28:3,6,11,15, 23 29:9,15 30:3,5,11,22 31:9,11,20 32:7,10,11,23 | | |
| minutes 53:22 | non-temporary 40:23 | | | |
| misunderstan ding 69:18 | note 10:19 | | | |
| moment 9:2 28:20 | notices 59:21 | | | |
| monitoring 25:14,18,19 59:22 | notwithstandi ng 61:18 | | | |
| monitors 25:13 | November 10:8 67:1 | | | |
| months 48:21 | numbered 23:20 | | | |
| Motion 18:9 19:15 | | | | |
| moving 72:10 | | | | |
| multiple 70:12 | | | | |
| <hr/> N <hr/> | | | | |
| named 11:22 | | | | |
| | | | | <hr/> P <hr/> |
| | | | | pages 57:18 paper 27:19 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| paragraph 71:7 | pertain 27:7 | 42:20 | preserving 55:19 | 23:8 43:6,21 46:5 57:5 62:21 65:21 |
| paralegal 26:5,6 | phone 20:14, 15 37:20,23 | possibility 17:13 | previously 18:17,19 39:2 61:18 62:5,17 64:20 70:4 | production 7:5 8:17,22 9:8 34:9 46:17 |
| part 14:11 59:9 67:16 69:18 | phones 35:2, 4,7 37:8 | possibly 19:24 | primarily 12:15 24:22 63:21 | products 21:13,14 |
| participated 15:22 | pieces 35:16 | potential 73:19 | printed 15:17 | prohibitive 52:15 |
| PDF 16:1 | place 18:15 19:4 28:14,17 29:4 30:11,14 41:3 44:17 51:16 61:11, 22 70:3 72:11,21 | potentially 27:10 | prior 6:8,10, 23 7:13 8:1 18:20 30:9 40:10 53:13 56:21 58:4 59:18 61:4 | promise 68:1 |
| pendency 6:4 26:24 34:5 70:13 | plaintiffs' 41:11 58:8 | practice 19:8 52:18 | privy 44:15 | provide 25:9 29:12 54:15 |
| pending 14:21 17:13 23:21 38:11 39:19 41:6 53:1 | point 5:11,17 25:15,16 43:6 46:3 55:12 60:4,15,20 | pre-existing 39:21 | problem 18:4 32:1 | provided 12:13 18:6 23:13,18 36:12,16 38:20 44:10 45:9 47:6 52:2 54:7 58:15 |
| people 24:3 48:13 50:22, 24 51:1 60:5 62:12 64:9 67:16 71:9,21 | pointing 29:13 | predecessors 8:10 | problems 9:8 | province 10:1 |
| percent 26:19 51:20 | policy 8:7 9:19,24 10:5 18:13,18,22 19:3,22 48:20,24 49:7,10 61:4, 11 | preservation 9:15,21 10:10 27:21 37:7 40:19 42:23 46:21 56:8 66:7,13,19 72:9 | procedure 8:4 9:19 | Public 4:3 |
| performed 51:24 | policy- making 42:13 | preserve 34:13,19 44:6 45:7 46:3,11 47:7 56:4 71:13,23 72:24 | proceedings 53:23 68:3 | purged 15:14 37:3 52:6 |
| period 67:22 | position 15:6 27:22 31:9 40:4 49:12 62:1 63:7 69:5,7 71:14 | preserved 16:2 17:24 26:24 36:24 37:12,23 38:5,8 48:17 49:24 50:4 51:7 64:22 65:18 69:2,12 | process 7:4 8:17 9:4 10:17 11:10, 14 14:13 15:22 45:23 46:14 53:6 64:12,17 67:2,17 72:4, 7 | purging 18:23 |
| person 20:16 22:13 35:8,11 44:19 50:8 | | | produce 54:14 55:4 | purpose 24:1,19,22 27:11 |
| person's 48:3 | | | produced | purposes 5:13 |
| personally 56:20 | | | | put 29:4 30:11 39:20 |
| personnel 10:23 52:2 | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| <hr/> Q <hr/> | recall 10:15 23:1 42:9 53:20 54:23 | reference 43:15 55:3 | 52:21 | rest 62:13 |
| question 5:15 23:12 38:22 66:11 | receipt 29:17 30:6 | referring 23:23 | request 41:11 47:6 58:7,13 | retains 35:8 |
| questions 4:24 12:7,9, 11 16:21 17:3 54:3 62:20 63:13 66:16 73:6,10,14 | receive 9:13 22:15,21 24:5,9,13 25:1 26:3 28:21 29:1 30:3 59:20 | refresh 23:4 | requesting 16:11 | return 26:3, 19 |
| quick 53:22 68:1 | received 23:2 24:3 25:4 29:8,10 50:24 61:14 68:17 | refuse 16:13 | requests 45:14 | returned 25:24 26:18 54:24 58:19 |
| <hr/> R <hr/> | receives 15:2 30:23 31:3 | regard 13:3 17:14 18:24 20:6 39:12 41:15,22 61:24 66:19 | required 27:24 | review 63:11 |
| rate 26:20 | receiving 27:18 61:9 | regular 22:7 | reserve 73:14,18 | reviewed 24:15 |
| re-depose 73:18 | recent 48:21 57:2 65:21 | related 71:11 | Resources 5:21 6:7,17 7:1 21:17 26:22 31:19 33:5 42:4,21 46:10 47:14 50:14 63:4 | reviewing 62:19 |
| reach 32:6, 11,23 33:5 37:5 53:16 70:7 | recently 61:16 66:23 | relates 60:23 65:19 67:5 | respond 29:16 | road 5:14 |
| reached 30:16 33:19 | recipient 31:10 56:6,7 | relevant 64:1 | response 18:9 19:14 22:21 23:2,7, 8,13 54:7 55:1 | Robertson 4:1,7,10 18:5 54:1 66:10 68:5 73:7 |
| read 16:5,8 18:5 24:17, 18,21 56:7 73:15 | recipients 22:9 44:1 | remains 47:14 | responses 22:15,19 | role 5:24 6:10 7:9 11:16 14:3 25:15 34:8 58:16 59:16 60:4 62:7 64:15 |
| realized 56:8 | recollection 23:5 | remember 19:20 20:8 42:12 43:13 | responsibility 28:1,8,10 59:11 69:6,23 70:2 71:15,21 | roles 13:5 42:15 |
| reason 10:4 18:3 21:20 28:16 33:9 43:7 | record 4:9,22 | repeat 5:5 | responsible 26:22 27:13 35:15 68:23 72:1,13 | rose 9:7 |
| reasonable 56:11 | records 61:23 | repeating 36:1 | responsive 44:3 | Ruby 15:4 |
| reasons 58:8 | recreated 51:3 | rephrase 31:7 | | rule 12:10 |
| | refer 12:14 21:1 23:4 | replacement 38:18 39:1 40:11 | | rules 4:20 |
| | | reported 71:22 | | <hr/> S <hr/> |
| | | reporter 5:1 | | safeguards 72:11 |
| | | Reporter/ notary 4:3 | | sake 4:22 16:24 |
| | | represent | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| Samples 38:14 50:11 | September 18:20 30:9 32:1 40:10 53:5,12,13,18 67:13 68:12 | sort 5:15 16:18 20:17 25:13 42:22 44:22 51:10 53:9 67:10,20 | 14:23 17:6 19:1 20:23 21:4,5 35:2 36:6,22 37:11 47:15 48:11 49:10,12 51:17 52:17 62:15,16 64:24 65:4,9, 14 66:5 | 40:5,13 41:19 42:7,18 43:11,22 45:19 52:2 56:23 59:14 65:4,10,19 68:22 69:22 71:10,11,19 72:15 |
| Sanctions 18:10 19:15 | served 19:4 | sparsed 7:20, 23 | | submit 62:15 |
| saved 15:17 | Services 35:18 36:3,5, 12 37:6 38:3 | speak 24:17 69:17 | state-issued 35:7,9,15 37:20,23 | submitted 13:14 18:8 19:16 26:9 |
| scenes 47:24 | settled 41:6 | specific 9:14 15:6 21:7 31:8 50:8 70:19 | stated 9:2 19:15 28:20 58:5 61:1 65:13 70:4,8 | sue 59:21 |
| scope 49:15 | share 44:4 | specifically 7:4 9:12 22:4 23:19 33:16 36:11,16 38:12 39:9 45:4 48:22 50:9 68:22 71:5 73:2 | statement 18:18 45:1 57:21 | sufficiently 69:14 |
| search 45:14 52:1 | Shawn 36:19 70:11 72:18 | speculation 14:10 59:9 70:1 | stating 38:2 | suit 7:10 |
| searched 46:1 52:8 | shifting 49:12 | spoken 48:22 70:16,20 | step 60:4 | suite 21:12, 13 64:7 |
| searching 36:10 45:13 53:5 | shoulder 16:7 | staff 11:4,22 13:3 17:15 18:24 31:9,21 32:4 35:5 38:18 39:1 40:12,24 61:10 63:20 69:22 | steps 72:8 | supercede 61:21 |
| secretaries 13:19 21:21 | sign 73:15 | staff's 61:5 | stored 8:23 9:15,22 10:21 17:23 18:23 34:13,20 42:24 43:4 46:4,11,22 47:8 49:19 50:17 55:19 61:5,12 69:12 73:1 | supervise 44:2,11 71:9 |
| secretary 10:20 11:5,11 12:4,5 13:11, 14,21 14:8 16:8 21:16,23 38:13,14 39:22,24 62:5,9 64:5 | signed 10:9 24:5,9 25:1,9, 23 26:17 28:21 | stand 10:4 | subject 13:4 17:19 19:23 24:7 27:9 28:2,9 31:22 34:12 35:6 36:23 39:3 | supervises 26:6 |
| secretary's 13:16 14:8 62:4,9 64:5 | significant 9:7 | start 4:7 43:3 | | supervision 71:18 |
| send 15:21 26:14 40:22 46:10 59:17 | simple 63:13 | state 4:8 | | supervisory 42:15 62:7 |
| sending 7:14 19:8 30:14 | simply 49:11 | | | supplemental 39:1 40:11 |
| sense 57:19 69:19 | situations 49:17 63:24 | | | supplementar y 40:17 |
| separated 18:24 | Slack 20:20 | | | suppose 73:11 |
| | slightly 8:10 48:4 | | | supposed |
| | sole 66:18 | | | |
| | solely 38:22 | | | |
| | someone's 12:21 48:1 58:7 | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| 56:3 surrounding 12:9 sworn 4:2 system 17:6 21:3,6,9,18, 24 27:6,8 51:18 65:14 | 47:7 48:18,23 49:6 51:14,23 52:11,24 53:10 55:18 56:3,13,22 59:3 61:3,8 62:22 66:7 67:12 68:11, 24 69:21 70:22 71:17 72:2,14,24 73:20 Technology's 18:13,22 telephone 51:18 template 8:9 temporarily 39:15 temporary 39:15 tenure 39:14 term 16:20 terminated 14:24 terms 35:16 45:14 testified 4:4 54:5 62:6,18 64:20 68:6 testifying 34:16 testimony 13:9 29:14 30:8 40:3,16 41:13,24 45:17 51:5 52:9,19 56:12 | 58:15 60:8 66:17 67:8 68:15 71:2 72:12,17 thing 73:17 things 4:7,21, 23 5:3 18:14 51:15 time 14:17 19:4 29:19,22 30:1 31:1 32:3,5,21 33:14,16 39:22 42:11 46:3 47:1 58:12,17,23 59:6 67:21 times 7:16, 18,20 56:19 70:15 title 5:20 31:5 today 13:9 29:7,14 30:8 34:17 40:3,16 41:24 45:1 52:19 57:21 66:17 71:2,14 told 38:4,9 45:20 totality 6:15 training 9:14 transfer 49:17 transferred 59:23 transfers 48:2 | transition 21:11 triggered 61:13 true 29:11 62:24 73:12 turned 54:18 type 9:14 typical 8:4 12:11 typically 12:8 20:10 26:17, 20 30:22 U umbrella 63:8 underneath 63:8 understand 5:4 24:24 60:19 understandin g 17:9 35:14 51:6 61:9,20 67:2,3 72:8 understood 68:18 unknown 39:17 updated 40:6 ups 38:11 V Vague 21:19 22:1 | versus 67:2 Virginia 7:8 8:23 12:13 20:1 24:11 28:22 31:19 35:2 45:6 47:15 53:15 voice 51:15 voicemail 51:15 voluminous 34:7 W WALTERS 73:9 Watts 14:3 week 39:16 West 7:8 8:23 12:13 20:1 24:10 28:22 31:19 35:2 45:6 47:15 53:15 whatsoever 64:16 whichever 59:24 wiped 65:5 wit 4:4 word 17:4 32:17 70:2 work 4:21 13:16 14:14 44:2 45:16 50:23 |
|--|---|---|---|--|

worked 19:22
64:3 67:16

working 31:5
34:5 45:12
47:3 63:17
72:4,6,7

wrapped 68:2

wv.gov 20:22
47:23

Y

year 10:8
18:21 30:9
40:10 52:22
57:6 68:12

years 6:18
21:10 30:16
41:5,7